

1 THE LAW OFFICES OF WILLIAM W. PALMER
2 WILLIAM W. PALMER – State Bar No. 146404
3 1241 Carter Road
4 Sacramento, California 95864
5 Telephone : (916) 972-0761
6 Facsimile: (916) 972-0877

7 Attorney for Plaintiffs Chris Lusby Taylor,
8 Nancy A. Pepple-Gonsalves, Gary Kesselman,
9 Susan Swinton, Dawn E. Struck, and William J.
10 Palmer

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
12 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

13 CHRIS LUSBY TAYLOR, NANCY A.
14 PEPPE-GONSALVES, GARY
15 KESSELMAN, SUSAN SWINTON, DAWN E.
16 STRUCK, and WILLIAM J. PALMER

17 As Taxpayers, and on behalf of themselves and
18 other persons similarly situated,

19 Plaintiff,

20 vs.

21 JOHN CHIANG, individually and in his
22 capacity as STATE CONTROLLER OF THE
23 STATE OF CALIFORNIA; STEVE WESTLY,
24 individually

25 Defendants.

Case No.: CIV. –S-01-2407 WBS

DECLARATION OF BRIAN D.
BOYDSTON IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR INTERIM
FEE AWARD

Hearing:

Date: October 15, 2007

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Courtroom: 5

(The Hon. Judge William B. Shubb)

DECLARATION OF BRIAN D. BOYDSTON

I, Brian D. Boydston, Esq., declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney at law licensed to practice law before all courts of the State
of California. I have worked as an associate counsel in this case with William W. Palmer,

1 attorney of record for Plaintiffs herein. I have personal knowledge of the facts contained
2 herein and if called as a witness I could and would testify to them.

3
4 2. I have invested significant time and effort in connection with the litigation of
5 this case on behalf of Plaintiffs and the putative Class Members. A true and correct report
6 listing the actual hours, including the date, the time expended, and the tasks performed, by
7 myself and members of my firm is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**. This time report (**Exhibit**
8 **A**) also details all of the expenses my firm has incurred in prosecuting this case.

9
10 3. As reflected in the time report (**Exhibit A**), I have been assisting Mr. Palmer
11 in this case since July of 2002. During that time members of my firm and I have spent
12 substantial time reviewing documents, drafting, reviewing, editing and proofreading briefs,
13 pleadings and correspondence. I have planned strategy, discussed and debated legal issues
14 and conferred extensively with Mr. Palmer on the relevant issues in this case. We have
15 spent substantial time meeting with different legislators and public interest groups in an
16 attempt to resolve the issues at the heart of this litigation.

17
18 4. My firm's rights to fees are contingent upon Mr. Palmer's fee agreement with
19 Plaintiffs, which is a contingency fee agreement. Under each of the fee agreements, my firm
20 and Mr. Palmer have been obligated to bear all of the risk that the case might not succeed, as
21 well as bear all of the costs and expenses incurred in litigating the case. I have never
22 received any payment of any legal fees from any client (or anyone else) in connection with
23 this case. Indeed, despite the fact that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals twice ordered the
24 Controller to pay costs in connection with the successful appeals, the Controller has never
25 paid those costs.
26
27
28

THE LAW OFFICES OF
William W. Palmer
 1241 Carier Road – Sacramento – California – 95864
 TELEPHONE (916) 972-0761

1 5. This case has proven to be difficult, complex, and enormously time- and
 2 resource-consuming. In total, the attorneys in our office have invested 286 hours, valued at
 3 \$350.00 per hour, for a total time-value of \$100,240.00 in attorneys fees, and an additional
 4 \$1,076.22 in expenses, and an additional \$9,590.01 in costs, for a total of \$109,830.01 in
 5 this case from inception through September 13, 2007, which represents the period for which
 6 the Plaintiffs seek an interim award of fees. The attorneys' \$350.00 rate is commensurate
 7 with their credentials and experience, and is reasonable based on not only the attorneys'
 8 capabilities, but also in the marketplace for complex, sophisticated litigation. I regularly
 9 communicate with attorneys from larger firms who have similar experience and credentials
 10 to me, Mr. Palmer and Mr. Culhane, and those attorneys typically charge higher (and
 11 sometimes significantly higher) hourly rates than \$350.00. Accordingly, \$350.00 per hour is
 12 reasonable based on the experience, credentials and capabilities of my firm, as well as based
 13 on market rates for similar work.

14 6. On behalf of Plaintiffs, I have used my best efforts to move this case forward
 15 expeditiously. However, my efforts and those of my colleagues have been frustrated by
 16 Defendants' litigation practices, which appear designed to use every possible means to delay
 17 the proceedings. While I respect the opposing counsel's efforts, which were initially
 18 successful, to defend the Controller's practices and to argue for immunity under the
 19 Eleventh Amendment, the Ninth Circuit rejected their arguments in its March, 2005,
 20 unanimous published opinion. *Taylor v. Westly*, 402 F.3d 924 (9th Cir. 2005) ("*Taylor I*"). In
 21 addition, the Ninth Circuit clearly held that the Controller's practices violate the Due
 22 Process Clause of the United States Constitution. At that point, we expected the Controller
 23 to significantly reform his practices and to seek a way to end this litigation through a

1 mutually-agreeable settlement. Instead, amazingly, following the *Taylor I* opinion,
 2 Controller Steve Westly actually *increased* the seizure of private property, and took
 3 increasingly aggressive and unsupported positions in this litigation.
 4

5 7. Plaintiffs immediately sought to enjoin further violations of the United States
 6 Constitution by moving for a preliminary injunction. When this was denied, Plaintiffs again
 7 appealed to the Ninth Circuit. While that appeal was pending, the Plaintiffs in a separate
 8 case pending in the Northern District, *Suever v. Westly*, No. C-01-00156 RS (E.D. Cal.)
 9 obtained another favorable ruling from the Ninth Circuit echoing the holding in *Taylor I*.
 10 *Suever v. Westly*, 439 F.3d 1142 (9th Cir. 2006). In 2007, the Ninth Circuit issued another
 11 unanimous published decision directing this Court to enter a preliminary injunction
 12 prohibiting further violations of the Due Process Clause. *Taylor v. Westly*, 488 F.3d 1197
 13 (9th Cir. 2007) (“*Taylor II*”). The *Taylor II* opinion explicitly relied on *Jones v. Flowers*, 126
 14 S.Ct. 1726 (2006) and *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Tr. Co.*, 339 U.S. 306 (1950). In
 15 addition, the *Taylor II* opinion recommended that this Court consider federal oversight of
 16 the Controller, in recognition of the reality that the Controller has taken no action
 17 whatsoever to correct his Unconstitutional practices despite the explicit rulings of *Taylor I*,
 18 *Suever* and the United States Supreme Court’s opinion in *Jones v. Flowers*. *Taylor II* at
 19 1202. This Court entered a Preliminary Injunction Order on June 1, 2007, which remains in
 20 effect.
 21
 22
 23

24 8. All of these activities, including Defendants’ compulsive denial of the reality
 25 that the Ninth Circuit has already decided this case in Plaintiffs’ favor, have dramatically
 26 increased the difficulty, complexity and expense of litigating this case.
 27
 28

1 9. Plaintiffs’ counsel has expended enormous resources creating the successful
2 outcome in this case. In addition to the tens of thousands of dollars of expenses that counsel
3 has incurred, this case has consumed an enormous amount of attorney time—time for which
4 none of the attorneys has ever received any compensation whatsoever. As a result, this case
5 has created significant hardship for Plaintiffs’ counsel. This case has taken its toll on my
6 personal financial situation, as well as my co-counsel. In addition to the burden of financing
7 this litigation, I have been deprived of the opportunity to take on other work that could have
8 generated a steady income for my firm. Likewise, because I have not received any
9 compensation for my work to date, I have lost the time-value of the income I would have
10 received if I were compensated regularly, as well as the opportunity to invest such income.

11
12
13 10. Nevertheless, because the Ninth Circuit ruled in our favor in March, 2005,
14 my co-counsel and I have elected to find a way to vindicate our clients’ rights, and to correct
15 the enormous injustice perpetrated by the Controller over the past two decades. On
16 August 27, 2007, Governor Schwarzenegger signed SB 86, which is the first concrete step
17 in correcting the Controller’s vast misconduct. Without our efforts, the 8.2 million owners of
18 the \$5.1 Billion Unclaimed Property Fund would never receive Constitutional Notice of the
19 seizure of their property, and the Controller would have continued to recklessly seize
20 billions more with abandon. This case will result in the vindication of important
21 Constitutional rights for millions of individuals, past and future. This is an extraordinary
22 result, particularly given the hurdles that Plaintiffs surmounted in the early phase of the case.
23 When my firm obtains an extraordinary result on behalf of a client, my clients will typically
24 pay a premium—*i.e.*, either a “bonus” or an increased billing rate, for the extraordinary
25
26
27
28

1 result. I am familiar with other firms who likewise receive a “premium” for extraordinary
2 results that they obtain on behalf of their clients.

3 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

4
5 Dated: September 18, 2007

6
7 /s/
Brian D. Boydston, Esq.

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE LAW OFFICES OF
William W. Palmer
1241 Carier Road – Sacramento – California - 95864
TELEPHONE (916) 972-0761

Pick & Boydston, LLP
A Partnership Including A Professional Corporation
1000 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 600
Los Angeles, California 90017
(213) 624-1996

Statement for the Period Ending August 31, 2007

Page: 1
09/15/07
Client No.: 6088-02H

Re: Taylor v. Westly

	Hours
07/22/02	
SG Confer re status with B. Boydston	0.20
BDB Telecon with W. Palmer, Confer in re status	0.50
07/23/02	
SG Review materials sent by William Palmer	2.30
07/24/02	
SG Review materials sent by W. Palmer	3.70
07/25/02	
SG Review documents by Bill Palmer	1.00
07/26/02	
SG Confer re status	0.20
BDB Confer in re status	0.20
08/02/02	
SG Review Palmer correspondence	0.30
08/08/02	
JCS Telecon with B. Palmer re status, Confer re status, Review file	0.60
BDB Telecon with W. Palmer	0.40
08/09/02	
SG Telecon with B. Palmer	0.30
BDB Telecon with W. Palmer	0.30
08/21/02	
SG Review documents to prepare complaint	1.20
08/29/02	
SG Review documents from Palmer, Confer with B. Boydston	5.50

Page: 2
 09/15/07
 Client No.: 6088-02H

Re: Taylor v. Westly

	Hours
08/30/02	
BDB Review file, Confer re status	2.50
SG Draft and revise memorandum, Confer with B. Boydston	4.00
09/03/02	
SG Draft and revise memorandum, Confer with B. Boydston	3.50
09/04/02	
SG Draft and revise memorandum, Confer with B. Boydston, Draft email to Palmer	3.00
10/01/02	
BDB Review and revise Taylor appeal brief	3.50
10/02/02	
BDB Telecon with B. Palmer	0.30
10/28/02	
BDB Confer re status with W. Palmer, Review file	1.20
11/13/02	
SG Telecon with B. Palmer, Review correspondence	0.60
11/15/02	
SG Review correspondence	0.20
11/21/02	
BDB Draft correspondence, Confer re status	1.80
12/02/02	
BDB Confer re status	0.30
01/06/03	
BDB Review and revise related pleadings	3.50
01/09/03	
BDB Review and revise related pleadings	3.50
01/10/03	
BDB Review and revise related pleadings	2.50
04/09/03	
BDB Review file, Telecon with B. Palmer	0.80
04/14/03	
BDB Review file, Draft correspondence	1.00

Page: 3
 09/15/07
 Client No.: 6088-02H

Re: Taylor v. Westly

	Hours
08/11/03 BDB Confer in re status	0.30
09/05/03 BDB Confer in re status	0.30
09/08/03 BDB Prepare for and attend status conference	1.00
09/30/03 BDB Meet and confer with James Harrison and Bill Palmer	1.50
10/06/03 BDB Attend status conference	1.20
10/24/03 BDB Telecon with W. Palmer	0.20
10/27/03 BDB Research attorneys fees issues, Telecon with W. Palmer and J. Harrison	3.10
10/28/03 BDB Research attorney general issues	1.80
10/29/03 BDB Confer in re status	0.30
11/06/03 BDB Research re attorneys fees, Draft brief	2.50
11/07/03 BDB Draft brief	1.80
11/12/03 SG Confer with B. Boydston re settlement conference	0.20
BDB Prepare for and attend settlement conference	6.00
11/18/03 BDB Prepare for and attend status conference and settlement conference	6.50
12/02/03 BDB Telecon with B. Palmer	0.80
12/03/03 BDB Conference call with B. Palmer, L.	

Page: 4
 09/15/07
 Client No.: 6088-02H

Re: Taylor v. Westly

	Hours
Harrison, R. Johansen and R. McDonald	1.20
12/04/03	
BDB Telecon with B. Palmer	0.50
12/10/03	
BDB Telecon with J. Harrison, Confer in re status, Review case law	1.30
12/11/03	
BDB Review draft correspondence	0.40
12/24/03	
BDB Telecon with B. Palmer	0.30
12/30/03	
BDB Review file, Telecon with W. Palmer	1.50
01/06/04	
BDB Telecon with Bill Palmer	0.30
01/07/04	
BDB Prepare for travel to and attend meeting with co-counsel, Draft notice	3.30
01/08/04	
BDB Telecon with Bill Palmer	0.50
01/20/04	
BDB Telecon with counsel	0.20
01/21/04	
BDB Telecons with R. Johanson, James Harrison, Bill Palmer and Rob McDonald	1.60
01/28/04	
BDB Attend related status conference	1.50
01/29/04	
BDB Telecon with Bill Palmer, and Rob McDonald	0.70
02/03/04	
BDB Telecon with B. Palmer	0.30
02/04/04	
BDB Telecon with B. Palmer	0.30
02/06/04	
BDB Telecon with B. Palmer	0.30

Page: 5
 09/15/07
 Client No.: 6088-02H

Re: Taylor v. Westly

	Hours
BDB Conference call with Bill Palmer, et al.	1.00
02/09/04	
BDB Prepare for and attend MSC	4.00
02/10/04	
BDB Telecon with B. Palmer	0.50
02/12/04	
BDB Telecon with B. Palmer	0.40
02/17/04	
BDB Telecon with Steve White	0.50
BDB Telecon with Bill Palmer	0.50
02/23/04	
BDB Telecon with Bill Palmer	0.60
02/24/04	
BDB Telecon with Bill Palmer, Review file	1.50
03/09/04	
JCS Review correspondence from B. Palmer	0.20
03/10/04	
JCS Review correspondence from B. Palmer	0.10
JCS Draft notes re above	0.10
03/11/04	
JCS Telecon with B. Palmer re above	0.10
JCS Telecon with B. Palmer	0.10
JCS Draft notes re above telecons	0.10
03/12/04	
JCS Review correspondence from B. Palmer	0.20
03/15/04	
JCS Confer with B. Boydston re status	0.10
03/16/04	
BDB Telecon with B. Palmer	0.50
03/24/04	
JCS Telecon with B. Palmer re above	0.10
03/30/04	
BDB Attend related status conference	1.30
BDB Confer in re status	0.60

Page: 6
 09/15/07
 Client No.: 6088-02H

Re: Taylor v. Westly

	Hours
03/31/04	
BDB Confer in re status	0.30
BDB Draft memo for Mr. Burton	0.50
05/04/04	
BDB Telecon with Jonathan Renner, Esq.	0.20
05/14/04	
BDB Draft memo	0.50
05/26/04	
BDB Review draft press release	0.20
06/03/04	
BDB Revise memo	0.30
06/10/04	
BDB Revise letter to J. Burton	0.30
06/21/04	
BDB Draft memorandum	0.30
06/28/04	
ES Review file re common fund operation	0.80
07/12/04	
ES Confer re status with B. Boydston	0.20
ES Review file and pleadings	2.00
07/14/04	
ABP Telecons with B. Palmer, Review file re status	1.00
07/15/04	
ES Review file and pleadings	1.50
07/19/04	
ES Telecon with B. Palmer re status	0.30
07/20/04	
ES Review correspondence from B. Palmer re tasks to be done	0.60
ES Confer with B. Palmer	0.20
07/21/04	
ES Review file and status re amendment/client agreement	0.70
07/22/04	
ES Make A. Pick travel arrangements	0.50

Page: 7
 09/15/07
 Client No.: 6088-02H

Re: Taylor v. Westly

	Hours
ES Confer with A. Pick re meeting in Sacramento	0.30
ES Draft email to B. Boydston re status	0.20
ES Email second amended complaint to B. Palmer	0.20
07/23/04	
ES Telecon with B. Palmer	0.30
ES Draft email to B. Palmer	0.20
ES Amend client fee agreement and send to B. Palmer	0.50
07/26/04	
ABP Prepare for and meet with L. Uhler, B. Palmer, D. Ackerman, J. Burton, A. Levy, D. Koeky, Confer re status	13.00
07/27/04	
ES Confer re status with A. Pick	0.30
ES Review second amended complaint and fax same to B. Palmer	0.40
ES Review B. Palmer's subpoena and prepare additional subpoenas	1.90
ABP Telecons with A. Levy and B. Palmer, Review file	0.80
07/28/04	
ES Review B. Palmer revisions, Telecon with B. Palmer	0.40
ABP Telecons with B. Palmer, Telecons with A. Levy, Review files	0.90
07/29/04	
ABP Telecons with B. Palmer, Confer re status, Telecon with A. Levy	3.80
07/30/04	
ABP Telecons with B. Palmer, Telecons with B. Boydston, Telecon with R. Johanson, Confer re status, Review files	2.30
08/03/04	
ES Telecon with A. Pick and B. Palmer re consolidation	0.40
08/04/04	
ES Review correspondence	0.30
08/20/04	
BDB Review file	3.50

Page: 8
 09/15/07
 Client No.: 6088-02H

Re: Taylor v. Westly

	Hours
08/23/04	
ES Confer with B. Boydston	0.20
BDB Review file	2.50
08/24/04	
BDB Review file	3.50
08/26/04	
BDB Review file	3.50
08/30/04	
BDB Draft memorandum	4.00
08/31/04	
BDB Telecon with Bill Harris	0.30
09/10/04	
BDB Draft memorandum	4.50
09/20/04	
BDB Draft correspondence	0.30
09/24/04	
BDB Telecon with Bill Palmer	0.50
09/28/04	
BDB Telecon with Art Levy	0.40
09/29/04	
BDB Telecon with Marc Levine, Esq., Telecon with Art Levy, Esq., Telecon with Bill Palmer	1.30
09/30/04	
BDB Telecon with Bill Palmer, Telecon with Richard de la Mora, Review file, Telecon with Art Levy, Telecon with Bill Palmer	2.40
10/04/04	
BDB Review file, Draft correspondence	0.80
10/07/04	
BDB Review file, Telecon with B. Palmer, Revise correspondence	1.00
10/11/04	
BDB Review file, Draft correspondence, Telecon with B. Palmer	0.80

Page: 9
 09/15/07
 Client No.: 6088-02H

Re: Taylor v. Westly

	Hours
10/18/04 BDB Prepare for, travel to and attend related status conference, Draft status report	2.40
10/19/04 BDB Draft correspondence	0.20
10/21/04 BDB Confer in re status	0.40
10/26/04 BDB Research pending legal issues	2.80
10/27/04 BDB Research pending legal issues	0.70
11/01/04 BDB Research pending legal issues	2.30
11/02/04 BDB Draft memorandum, Telecon with B. Palmer	4.50
11/03/04 BDB Research pending legal issues	3.00
11/08/04 BDB Review pending legal issues	1.70
11/09/04 BDB Draft memorandum	2.50
11/10/04 BDB Draft memorndum	2.50
11/12/04 BDB Telecon with W. Palmer	0.50
11/24/04 BDB Prepare for and attend related hearing	2.50
12/01/04 BDB Draft memorandum	1.80
12/16/04 BDB Attend related hearing	0.50
01/12/05 BDB Telecon with W. Palmer	1.50

Page: 10
 09/15/07
 Client No.: 6088-02H

Re: Taylor v. Westly

	Hours
01/19/05	
BDB Prepare for and attend related status conference, Draft status report, Review and revise motion to amend	3.00
02/11/05	
BDB Telecon with W. Palmer	0.40
03/24/05	
BDB Review file and court order	3.50
03/25/05	
BDB Draft memorandum	2.80
03/28/05	
ES Review file, Draft Freedom of Information request	1.00
03/29/05	
ES Research and download Taylor v. Westly opinion, Review same	0.80
BDB Review court's opinion, Review related cases, Telecon with W. Palmer	4.80
03/30/05	
ES Review emails from B. Palmer	0.30
04/03/05	
BDB Prepare for related hearing	1.50
04/04/05	
BDB Attend related hearing	1.50
04/08/05	
BDB Confer in re status, Draft memorandum	1.50
04/12/05	
BDB Review and revise motion papers	3.50
04/26/05	
BDB Telecon with court clerk	0.40
04/27/05	
BDB Telecon with W. Palmer	0.50
05/17/05	
BDB Telecon with David Cohen, Esq., Draft correspondence	2.90

Page: 11
 09/15/07
 Client No.: 6088-02H

Re: Taylor v. Westly

	Hours
05/30/05	
BDB Review and revise TRO papers	8.50
06/21/05	
BDB Telecon with W. Palmer	0.70
06/22/05	
BDB Telecon with W. Palmer	0.50
06/23/05	
BDB Telecon with W. Palmer	0.40
06/24/05	
BDB Telecon with W. Palmer	0.50
08/19/05	
BDB Telecon with W. Palmer	0.50
09/26/05	
BDB Review and revise opening brief	6.50
10/13/05	
BDB Attend related status conference	1.00
12/19/05	
BDB Telecon with W. Palmer	0.20
02/01/06	
BDB Telecon with Bill Palmer	0.30
02/02/06	
BDB Attend related status conference	1.00
02/09/06	
BDB Telecon with Bill Palmer	0.30
04/04/06	
BDB Attend related status conference	0.70
04/24/06	
BDB Draft brief	2.80
05/10/06	
BDB Draft memornadum	3.50
05/17/06	
ES Review cases for B. Boydston	0.30
BDB Draft related appeal brief	6.50

Page: 12
 09/15/07
 Client No.: 6088-02H

Re: Taylor v. Westly

	Hours
05/25/06	
BDB Review and revise related opening brief	2.80
06/09/06	
BDB Review and revise related opening brief	3.50
07/05/06	
JCS Confer with E. Syverson re July 10, 2006 status conference, Draft notes re above conference	0.30
07/10/06	
JCS Review file in preparation for related status conference, Appear at status conference, Confer with E. Syverson and A. Pick re above, Review file for notice re above	2.30
08/16/06	
BDB Telecon with W. Palmer re appellate hearing	0.50
10/16/06	
BDB Telecon with Bill Palmer	0.30
11/15/06	
BDB Review Suever opinion	0.30
11/28/06	
BDB Telecon with R. Johanson	0.20
02/06/07	
BDB Review correspondence, Telecon with Bill Palmer	0.40
04/18/07	
BDB Attend related tatus conference	1.70
04/30/07	
BDB Review <u>Taylor 2</u>	0.40
05/09/07	
BDB Telecon with B. Palmer, Telecon with R. Johanson	0.50
05/21/07	
BDB Review and revise preliminary injunction papers	3.50

Page: 13

09/15/07

Client No.: 6088-02H

Re: Taylor v. Westly

	Hours	
06/04/07		
BDB Review preliminary injunction re Taylor, Confer in re status	2.40	
06/08/07		
BDB Review media inquiries, Confer in re status	1.50	
09/05/07		
BDB Telecon with W. Palmer	0.40	
09/07/07		
BDB Telecon with W. Palmer, Review and revise motion for award	2.50	
09/13/07		
BDB Draft declaration	1.30	
Total Fees	286.40	100,240.00

08/30/02 Facsimile	8.50
02/06/03 Facsimile - 12/17/2002 - 02/06/2003	11.00
05/08/03 Photocopying	32.69
05/30/03 Facsimile (February - May)	69.00
08/01/03 Photocopying	679.81
10/30/03 Facsimile	146.00
11/30/03 Facsimile	2.00
04/30/04 Facsimile	28.00
04/30/04 Facsimile	53.00
05/01/07 Photocopying	21.05
06/05/07 Photocopying	25.17
Total Expenses	1,076.22

09/30/02 Lexis Research	226.98
10/31/02 Lexis Research	453.18
11/06/02 Messenger	11.50
11/07/02 Messenger	64.64
11/07/02 Federal Express	41.60
11/07/02 Federal Express	24.18
11/08/02 Messenger	45.35
11/30/02 Lexis Research	56.01
12/06/02 Messenger	65.42
12/06/02 Messenger	9.00
01/10/03 Messenger	55.39
01/17/03 Messenger	48.65

Page: 14
 09/15/07
 Client No.: 6088-02H

Re: Taylor v. Westly

01/21/03 Messenger	15.75
01/31/03 Lexis Research	101.89
01/31/03 Lexis Research	42.95
02/04/03 Messenger	15.75
02/04/03 Messenger	45.35
02/04/03 Messenger	45.35
02/07/03 Travel Expense	9.00
02/21/03 Travel Expense	9.00
03/07/03 Messenger	48.65
03/17/03 Travel Expense	9.00
03/20/03 Filing Fee	25.30
03/31/03 Lexis Research	278.06
04/15/03 Travel Expense	9.00
04/30/03 Postage - 12/17 - 02/06/2003	6.05
05/09/03 Messenger	53.35
05/27/03 Messenger	80.09
05/28/03 Messenger	42.05
05/30/03 Postage (March - May)	82.60
05/31/03 Lexis Research	277.03
06/06/03 Travel Expense	9.00
06/20/03 Messenger	35.45
06/25/03 Travel Expense	9.00
06/30/03 Lexis Research	207.05
07/10/03 Messenger	59.95
07/17/03 Federal Express	26.89
07/31/03 Postage	71.40
07/31/03 Lexis Research	13.60
07/31/03 Lexis Research	11.07
08/01/03 Messenger	66.54
09/05/03 Travel Expense	9.00
09/08/03 Travel Expense	9.00
09/30/03 Postage	66.05
09/30/03 Lexis Research	30.83
09/30/03 Postage	35.84
10/02/03 Messenger	45.35
10/17/03 Travel Expense	45.00
10/17/03 Travel Expense	30.00
10/29/03 Messenger	15.75
10/30/03 Postage	6.45
10/31/03 Lexis Research	37.78
10/31/03 Lexis Research	35.81
11/10/03 Messenger	15.75
11/30/03 Postage	6.12
12/31/03 Lexis Research	29.87
12/31/03 Postage	14.92
01/26/04 Messenger	65.57
01/31/04 Travel Expense	9.00
01/31/04 Postage	2.86
02/06/04 Messenger	95.89
02/11/04 Messenger	43.65
02/13/04 Federal Express	23.89

Page: 15
 09/15/07
 Client No.: 6088-02H

Re: Taylor v. Westly

02/26/04 Messenger	15.75
02/29/04 Postage	17.81
03/30/04 Travel Expense	6.00
04/09/04 Messenger	58.69
04/23/04 Filing Fee	165.00
04/23/04 Messenger	60.75
04/30/04 Postage	16.00
04/30/04 Lexis Research	184.05
05/07/04 Travel Expense	32.45
05/31/04 Lexis Research	205.29
07/07/04 Travel Expense	8.00
07/26/04 Travel Expense	218.20
07/26/04 Travel Expense	127.36
07/31/04 Postage	13.65
07/31/04 Lexis Research	4.60
07/31/04 Postage	16.00
08/02/04 Filing Fee	36.30
08/19/04 Messenger	48.65
08/30/04 Messenger	50.25
08/31/04 Lexis Research	38.77
08/31/04 Lexis Research	214.58
09/23/04 Travel Expense	6.00
10/31/04 Lexis Research	25.58
11/12/04 Messenger	55.25
11/30/04 Lexis Research	263.58
12/01/04 Messenger	55.25
01/20/05 Messenger	44.00
01/20/05 Messenger	42.55
01/25/05 Filing Fee	36.30
01/25/05 Filing Fee	36.30
03/25/05 Messenger	50.30
03/31/05 Lexis Research	128.11
03/31/05 Lexis Research	237.91
04/04/05 Travel Expense - Parking	9.00
04/27/05 Messenger	57.12
06/30/05 Lexis Research	48.53
07/01/05 Messenger	49.85
07/18/05 Travel Expense	6.00
07/31/05 Lexis Research	75.28
09/12/05 Travel Expense	6.00
09/30/05 Lexis Research	20.40
10/03/05 Messenger	47.74
10/13/05 Travel Expense	6.00
10/24/05 Filing Fee	100.00
10/24/05 Filing Fee - Appeal	655.00
12/31/05 Lexis Research	45.61
01/04/06 Travel Expense	198.40
01/04/06 Travel Expense	3.00
02/02/06 Travel Expense	6.00
02/02/06 Travel Expense	6.00
04/04/06 Travel Expense	9.00

Page: 16
09/15/07
Client No.: 6088-02H

Re: Taylor v. Westly

04/27/06 Messenger	30.80
05/31/06 Lexis Research	17.24
06/09/06 Messenger	30.80
06/15/06 Filing Fee	40.00
06/15/06 Messenger	44.85
06/15/06 Messenger	58.67
06/15/06 Messenger	25.57
06/20/06 Filing Fee	40.00
06/30/06 Lexis Research	102.92
07/06/06 Messenger	48.15
07/13/06 Federal Express	46.99
07/31/06 Lexis Research	125.80
09/18/06 Travel Expense	9.00
09/30/06 Lexis Research	1,358.53
10/27/06 Messenger	26.35
11/01/06 Messenger	50.27
12/08/06 Travel Expense	9.00
01/07/07 Travel Expense	9.00
03/31/07 Travel Expense	9.00
04/06/07 Messenger	65.41
04/18/07 Travel Expense	10.00
06/19/07 Travel Expense	6.00
07/03/07 Messenger	59.00
07/05/07 Travel Expense	10.00
07/06/07 Travel Expense	6.00
	<hr/>
Total Advances	9,590.01
Total Current Fees and Costs	109,830.01
Balance Due	<u><u>109,830.01</u></u>